DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 037 CS 003 691

AUTHOR Spiegel, Dixie Lee; Sherry, Margaret
TITLE Learning Disability or Reading Disability: An Annotated Bibliography for Coming Together.
INSTITUTION Madison Public Schools, Wis.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Annotated Bibliographies; *Educational Diagnosis; Elementary Education; *Learning Disabilities; *Reading Difficulty; *Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Reading

ABSTRACT

This bibliography lists readings that will help reading specialists and learning-disabilities specialists learn about one another's disciplines. Readings are grouped in six categories: overview of the controversy; labels and services; language, linguistics, and reading; cognition and reading; tools for identifying learning or reading problems; and educational strategies. Each article has a general annotation and two critical annotations, one by a learning-disabilities teacher and one by a reading specialist. (AA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 144037

Learning Disability or Reading Disability:

An Annotated Bibliography for Coming Together

Dixie Lee Spiegel
Margaret Sherry

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dixie Lee Spiegel
Margaret Sherry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Madison Metropolitan School District
Wisconsin

CS003691

Reading teachers and learning disabilities teachers too often view each other with suspicion. Although much of this suspicion is due to the realities of competition over funding and access to students, a great deal of mistrust is a result of mutual ignorance about each other's fields. This bibliography is an attempt to provide a list of readings for both reading specialists and LD specialists who wish to learn more about the other discipline. Readings have been grouped into six major categories: overview of the controversy; labels and services; language; linguistics, and reading; cognition and reading; tools for identifying learning or reading problems; and educational strategies.

Each article has a general annotation, followed by two critical annotations. The annotations marked LD were written by Peg Sherry, a learning disabilities program support teacher. The RT annotations were written by Dixie Lee Spiegel, a reading specialist. The critical annotations were included for two reasons: 1) To indicate the extent to which a member of one discipline agrees or disagrees with an author representing the other discipline, and 2) to indicate to what degree a specialist considers valid or representative the comments of an author from her own field. Improved communication between the two fields will come about only if specialists are familiar with the theories and practices of both fields. Furthermore, specialists need to be aware of how practitioners in the other discipline react to the theories and practices of their own field. We hope that the more teachers read about each other's field and communicate with each other, the better will be their understanding of the many points of common interest. Concentrating on these common interests and on the primary goal for both groups -- helping children learn -- should help resolve many of the apparent differences between learning disabilities teachers and reading teachers.

I. Overview

Brown, V. & Botel, M. Dyslexia: Definition or treatment? (ED 058 014) 1972.

Brown and Botel review the literature about dyslexia published after 1955. They discuss problems in defining and diagnosing dyslexia and describe various treatment approaches. An annotated bibliography is included.

LD: This thorough review will help LD teachers develop an understanding of the broad issues regarding reading disabilities. Of special interest is the section on assessment, which differentiates between assessments that describe the reading status of the learner and those that evaluate the processes by which the child learns to read. Emphasis is given to the latter approach.

RT: The authors' warning that no one method is appropriate for all disabled readers may cause teachers who are certain they have found "the" answer to re-evaluate their programs.

Burnett, R.W. Role of the reading teacher in learning disorders. In J. Hartstein (Ed.), Current concepts in dyslexia. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1971.

Burnett, a reading teacher, gives an overview of the place of remedial reading instruction in the total educational process and outlines what a reading teacher does to help a disabled reader. The author concludes with a reminder that children learn differently and at different paces and that labelling children should be discouraged.

RT: The article appears to be a representative statement of the issues from the reading teacher's viewpoint. Burnett accurately voices the concern of many reading specialists that learning disabilities teachers often involve the child in therapeutic strategies that have little relevance to what it is the child is expected to learn. In addition, Burnett points out, reading teachers often view the LD staff as "outsiders" who have little experience in the real world. One especially valuable insight offered is that reading and learning disabilities teachers often follow the same procedures but communication between the two disciplines fails because the procedures have different labels.

LD: LD teachers will gain tremendous insight into reading, reading programs, reading teachers, and the problems surrounding the current debate between LD and reading specialists. Burnett presents in a professional manner the issues which must be addressed in order to serve the severely disabled reader. The article opens an avenue for better communication between the two disciplines.

Freshour, F.W. Dyslexia: A sure cure. Elementary English, 1974, 51, 864-865; 893.

Freshour's sure cure is to stop using the term. He suggests that energies are better spent in determining children's specific strengths and weaknesses rather than in labeling the children themselves.

RT: Using a delightful mildly sarcastic style, Freshour points out the confusion resulting from the use of "dyslexia" to label a myriad of types of reading and/or learning disabilities. This article would provide a good introduction to problems in the field of reading disabilities.

LD: Amen! This brief, succinct article may help clarify the confusion in terminology in regard to learning disabilities and severe reading disabilities.

Keeney, A.H. & Keeney, V.T., (Ed.) Dyslexia: Diagnosis and treatment of reading disorders. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1968.

This book is a collection of fourteen articles by specialists from education, medicine, and psychology. The book deals with definition, etiology, characteristics, and management and treatment of dyslexia.

RT: Keeney and Keeney's book is intended to be used primarily by medical practitioners. However most of the articles can be easily understood by educators with only limited knowledge of physiological terms. The authors in general present a conservative viewpoint about the problem of dyslexia and offer no magic cures. For the reading teacher, the book is useful because it places various problems that are often correlated with reading disability -- such as poor eye movements, mixed dominance, and motor control -- in the proper perspective. The question and answer chapters following each main section of the text are especially valuable for the reader who may have found that his or her specific questions were not answered in the basic articles.

LD: The explanations of medical terminology may help teachers to understand reports of neurological examination. Although no remediation suggestions are given, some valuable suggestions are made in the final chapter about needed research. A lucid overview is given of various classifications of dyslexia; but the overview does little to discriminate between learning disabilities and dyslexia.

Lerner, J.W. Reading and learning disabilities. Elementary English, 1973, 50, 265-269.

Lerner gives a short overview of the LD field and a review of several areas of concern in LD: diagnostic-teaching, sensory-motor and perceptual-motor development, perception, memory, language, cognition, and maturational, psychological, and social factors.

RT: This brief article can serve as a reminder that reading is more than just decoding and that many factors contribute to the child's success in reading. Lerner's inclusion of sensory and perceptual-motor development as an area of concern, in spite of her own conclusion that research has not supported the importance of these skills to academic achievement, is indicative of the reluctance that the special education field has to give up interest in this area.

LD: This article could assist LD and reading teachers who are concerned with overlap and duplication in their professional arenas. The author describes from her perspective the different areas of interest to each field and concludes that the research in each field should be beneficial to both.

Money, J. (Ed.). The disabled reader. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

The book is a collection of papers on topics ranging from the origin and correlates of reading disability through specific techniques for remediation. Five case studies are also included.

RT: The choice of papers is excellent; a very wide range of opinion and emphasis is represented. This diversity in approach helps to underscore that no single cause exists for reading disability, that no single type of reading disability exists, and logically, no single "cure" is likely to be found.

LD: The average LD teacher may be overwhelmed by the broad range of topics. However specific papers critiquing techniques and giving options are very helpful. The case studies with listing of assessment tools are useful.

Sartain, H.W., Larsen, S.C., and Stick, S. Who shall teach the LD child? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1976, 9, 488-526. (Symposium)
In this series of articles, representatives from three disciplines present their perceptions of the role of the reading specialist, the learning disabilities teacher, and the speech pathologist in the education of the learning disabled child.

RT: Sartain tends to be too specific when he describes the procedures and techniques used by a reading specialist. Many good reading teachers do use these techniques, but other approaches are equally valid and successful. Sartain also appears to favor a very restricted definition of a learning disability. In general, however, the article gives a clear presentation of the issues and of the services usually available outside of special education to children with reading problems.

As Larsen describes the academic approach to identification and remediation, no differences emerge between what a good remedial reading teacher does and the procedures of the learning disabilities teacher. Larsen appears to assume that children with severe academic disabilities will be seen by the LD teacher and those with only "mild underachievement" will be taught by the reading specialist. However Larsen offers little rationale for or proof of this division of responsibilities. His final suggestion -- that children be helped by professionals who have been chosen on the basis of their particular competencies and not because of their labels -- is helpful, but this solution assumes that reading, LD, and speech professionals are all available within the school. Too often an either/or decision has been made when hiring personnel.

Stick has a rather narrow view of the role of the classroom teacher. In addition he places too much emphasis on the importance of language in reading. Stick does express well many of the aspects of the relationship between reading and language but he ignores the unique problems that are inherent in reading because it is written language.

He also seems unaware that many reading teachers are well versed in language development and psycholinguistics.

LD: These articles are most useful when read together. They are of particular interest to LD teachers who are seeking to define the parameters of responsibility. The issues are fairly well identified and needed recommendations are made for cooperative efforts, mutual respect, professional self-evaluation, and a reappraisal of skills needed to instruct the LD students. The articles should prompt LD teachers to question what their own competencies are in relation to those of other available professionals.

Symposium No. 11 Remedial reading and learning disabilities: Are they the same or different? Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9, 117-181.

This symposium series focuses on important issues that apparently divide the fields of learning disabilities and remedial reading. The series has a lead article by Lerner, seven reaction articles by specialists in LD, reading, and other fields, and a rebuttal by Lerner.

RT: Lerner, who is introduced as having a background in both remedial reading and LD, has a very limited concept of what reading is and what a reading teacher does. She has chosen a very restrictive program -- a skills management program -- to exemplify reading instruction. In addition, her assertion that teachers of reading perceive reading growth as a series of precise and necessary developmental stages is unwarranted and shows little contact with practitioners or current reading programs.

LD: The article is restrictive in its overview of the concerns of both reading and the LD field.

RT: Kirk takes Lerner to task for presenting a simplistic view of both fields. Kirk herself has a broader view of reading. In addition she makes the important point that there are many kinds of reading problems and that many of these problems have extrinsic causes and are not due to a learning disability by anyone's definition.

LD: Kirk highlights some of the different emphases in each field, focusing on terminology that appears to cause misunderstanding.

RT: As did Kirk, List emphasizes that not all reading problems are learning disabilities. She also criticizes Lerner's implicit assumption that basic agreement exists within each field.

LD: List's model of overlap between the two fields helps put this confusing issue in better perspective. Her emphasis on the lack of agreement within each field is thought-provoking. Her review of the research is good.

RT: For the teacher of reading who may be unfamiliar with the LD field, Newcomer's article is an important supplement to Lerner's. Newcomer stresses that many of the theories in the LD field are unproven. The process model in particular is attacked for not having shown a relationship to reading or other areas of academic achievement. Newcomer points out the lack of validity and reliability in most instruments used by LD teachers to diagnose precise areas of deficit.

LD: Newcomer's well documented article gives her view of the major weaknesses within the LD field. Her final conclusions that "there is no shortage of children with reading problems" and that specialists from both disciplines might be employed to serve them are well taken.

RT: Senf criticizes Lerner for her emphasis only on the differences between the two fields rather than on the areas of both agreement and disagreement. He also suggests other practical questions that might be of interest to the reading teacher who must compete with the LD teacher for both students and funding.

LD: Senf's emphasis on the separate training programs, administrative procedures, and professional organizations, and on potential competition for funding and students is of enormous importance to the LD teacher. Consideration of these points should promote self-evaluation of career and personal objectives.

RT: Jakupcak suggests three areas of inquiry that might unite the two fields within a broader framework. The reading teacher should consider carefully Jakupcak's suggestion of using a specific behavioral description of how an individual child performs a reading task rather than a checklist of labels and esoteric terms.

LD: Jakupcak's attempt to seek broader areas of unification between the two fields should appeal to the LD teacher whose primary concern lies with the student's academic progress and successes rather than with underlying processes.

RT: Adams attacks the classification approach to dealing with children with reading problems for not helping the teacher decide what or how to teach. She suggests that Piagetian theory may provide a more relevant model for reading development. However, Adams' description of the role of Piagetian theory in reading is incomplete and lacks specific suggestions for the teacher of reading.

LD: Adams' description of cognitive development and its relationship to learning to read may provide information for the LD teacher not yet familiar with these concepts. However the article is overly general and presents a simplistic view of the relationship between cognitive development and reading. There is little information to show how these concepts relate to the LD child.

RT: Kline criticizes Lerner's unbalanced treatment of the two fields and her high-handed technique of assigning spokespersons for LD and reading. Kline suggests the real problems may be economically and politically based -- "territory, tenure, and training."

LD: Kline's very broad scope in dealing with the reading/LD issue provides the LD teacher with more "fuel" for examining how his or her instructional techniques relate to the individual learner. Kline's statement that "the field of reading subsumes the entire field of learning disabilities" is open to question.

RT: Lerner's response summarizes many of the respondents' criticisms and defends her emphasis on the disparities between the two fields. She often fails to respond to the major issues raised.

LD: Lerner's final response does little more than summarize. She offers few new arguments in defense of her position. The symposium series itself is an excellent composite of the issues, and while it does not provide answers, it structures and redefines those issues.

Swarthout, G. and Swarthout, V. Whales to see the. New York: Doubleday, 1975.

The authors tell the story of a field trip by a class of neurologically impaired children to see whales migrating.

RT: This sensitive book would be an excellent introduction to the LD field for both teachers and intermediate level children. The emphasis on medication for the LD child was a bit strong, however.

LD: The book is certain to appeal to parents as well as to intermediate level children. It has a good human relations focus and is a gentle and sympathetic presentation of the problems that neurologically impaired children have in coping with daily social pressures. The teacher's attempts to deal with behavior through love and understanding are interesting in light of the behavioral emphasis in many LD programs. Unfortunately, there was too much unquestioning acceptance of the benefits of medication.

II. Labels and Services

Artley, A.S. and Hardin, V.B. A current dilemma: Reading disability or learning disability? The Reading Teacher, 1976, 29, 361-366.

Artley and Hardin review the history of the controversy over reading and learning disabilities, briefly discuss current points of disagreement or confusion, and make some suggestions for resolving the dilemma.

RT: The authors make the excellent suggestion that broader training in learning theory, diagnostic techniques, and remedial practices is necessary for specialists in both fields. Too often reading teachers receive a minimum of theoretical background and learning disabilities teachers receive too little training in applying theory to the actual education of the child.

LD: The authors wisely suggest that both groups need to give up categorical labels and vested interests in order to diagnose and treat students based on educational needs. The authors' stress on the "in-child" deficit is in agreement with their interpretation of the 1968 National Advisory Committee's recommended definition of LD. However, readers should be aware that that definition is undergoing change.

Hartman, N.C. and Hartman, R.K. Perceptual handicap or reading disability? The Reading Teacher, 1973, 26, 684-95.

The authors discuss from a reading teacher's viewpoint the differences in diagnostic and remediation techniques used by reading teachers and LD

teachers. They conclude that a false dichotomy has been created by differing terminology, diagnostic tools, and training, and that indeed "most specialists are probably looking at the same reading problem from different vantage points."

LD: This article is a somewhat cursory, over-simplification of a complex issue. The article may be of benefit to LD teachers who are unaware of how the LD field is sometimes perceived by other specialists.

RT: The review of procedures used by both LD and reading teachers leads this reader to conclude that although there may be little or no difference in the type of child seen by specialists of the two fields, a great dichotomy does exist between the theories and practices of the two fields. The extensive bibliography should be of interest to reading teachers who want to become familiar with research into process training.

Kline, L.W. Label not the learner. The Reading Teacher, 1973, 26, 452-3.

In this editorial Kline warns against simplistic labelling. Labelling in itself doesn't help solve the problem. In addition, labels are harmful because they usually become permanent and often exclude children in need of help who don't precisely fit a specific, narrow label.

RT: Kline makes the excellent point that our present state of knowledge does not permit us to tag each child with a specific label. His warning of the dangers of categorizing children with several learning problems under a single label should be noted.

LD: Kline pleads for defining labels for constructive purposes. He also identifies funding requirements as a primary source of the misuse of labels.

Lane, P. Let's deal from a straight deck. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1976, 9 8-10.

Editor Lane attacks the 1976 IRA resolution on learning disabilities. Both the resolution itself and Lane's reaction to it are presented.

RT: Much of Lane's negative response to the resolution must seem warranted to one in the LD field. As a result of compromise and perhaps as a result of the very forces Lane suspects, the resolution does appear to be an attack on the LD discipline. However, Lane fails to recognize many of the real issues expressed in the resolution. Funding is being provided for many programs that do not have empirical support for their claims; children are being misclassified so that they will receive help from someone because no other programs are available; LD teachers are giving reading instruction without any training in reading. The resolution's call for training in both areas is a positive step toward healing the rift between the two disciplines.

LD: This is an extremely important article. The critical aspect of both the resolution and the article lies in the emotional tone of both and in the apparent breakdown of rational communication between the two professions.

III. Language, Linguistics, and Reading

Emans, R. Linguistics and phonics. The Reading Teacher, 1973, 26, 477-482.

Emans reviews misconceptions about phonics and its relation to linguistics. Emans emphasizes the need for systematic beginning reading instruction, with teachers understanding that linguistic theories "must be modified by theories from other disciplines and by. . .effective practice in the classroom."

LD: The article is a good overview of linguistic applications to beginning reading and may help to broaden understanding of what goes on in the act of reading. Many biases held by LD teachers regarding reading instruction could be disspelled.

RT: Emans' cautions regarding the implications of linguistics for reading instruction are especially important because of the current trend in using the linguistic label on all reading materials. His analysis may lead teachers to view such materials more critically and to avoid being seduced by the magic word -- linguistics.

Fagan, W.T. Transformations and comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 1971, 25, 169-172.

Fagan reports the results of a study that investigated the effects on comprehension of number and types of transformations in written passages. The findings indicated that certain kinds of transformations are associated with problems in comprehension, that the number of transformations within a sentence does not seem to be important, and that the comprehension of individual sentences was more affected by transformations than was the comprehension of the whole passage. Implications for instruction were included.

RT: Fagan presents the topic of transformational grammar succinctly and clearly. The article can serve to introduce the teacher of reading to an important variable in comprehension. The suggestion of making students aware of the redundancy of the language is especially valuable to teachers of children who are having difficulties in learning to read.

LD: The LD teacher may gain insight into the interaction between reading comprehension and linguistic structure. Specific instructional implications should be investigated for use with LD students with reading or language deficits.

Hodges, R.E. and Rudorf, D.H. Language and learning to read. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

The editors have brought together writings of nineteen contributors from several fields "to show that effective reading instruction is based upon an understanding of language and how children use it." The eight sections range from the theoretical constructs of linguistics to the practical application of these constructs to instruction.

LD: While the essays in this collection are not concerned specifically with learning disabilities, the information about reading and language is highly important to the LD teacher searching for ways to meet students' individual reading and language needs.

RT: The book is an excellent blend of theory and practice. The concepts are presented so clearly that the book could serve as an introduction to psycholinguistics and reading for someone with only a basic background in reading theory.

Smith, F. The role of prediction in reading. Elementary English, 1975, 52, 305-311.

Smith defines prediction as "the prior elimination of unlikely alternatives" and demonstrates how prediction is absolutely necessary in speaking, listening and reading.

RT: Smith's article provides several strong arguments for teaching children to read fully-formed language and not isolated lists of words or contrived, unrealistic sentences.

LD: The author's description of predictive strategies may provide LD teachers with insights into new areas for instructional intervention and programming.

Wiig, E.H. and Semel, E.M. Productive language abilities in learning disabled adolescents. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1975, 8, 45-53.

This study compared productive language skills of LD and academically achieving students. Several specific deficits in expressive language were found in the LD adolescents. The authors interpret these deficits as indicative of delays in some aspects of cognition and of semantic categorization. The authors suggest these delays are related to reduction in the ability to retrieve verbal labels and syntactic structures.

RT: Wiig and Semel's study could have important implications for the use of oral reading for diagnosis of reading difficulties. More research is needed to show the relationship of these verbal deficits to reading. Perhaps this research in part could compare the oral and silent reading comprehension of LD students.

LD: This article contains research of great interest to LD teachers concerned with the language deficits of their students. The detailed descriptions of the tests and the analyses made on the basis of these tests are particularly useful.

IV. Cognition and Reading

Cox, M.B. The effect of conservation ability on reading competency. The Reading Teacher, 1976, 30, 251-258.

Cox reports a study that showed that children who were reading at or above grade level were better at conservation tasks than children reading below grade level. Cox gives detailed descriptions of the tasks used and theorizes why failure to understand conservation may be related to failure to learn to read.

RT: Cox's explicit descriptions of the conservation tasks should be helpful to those interested in these theories. Her explanations of the relationship of these conservation tasks to reading were most persuasive.

LD: The article would be of special interest to anyone searching for alternative reasons for why learning to read is particularly difficult for some beginning readers.

Crump, C. Teachers, questions, and cognition. Educational Leadership 1970, 27, 657-659.

The article reviews the kinds of questions and the types of cognitive response that such questions evoke. Crump points out that teachers frequently limit thinking by asking only memory-type questions.

LD: This thought-provoking article suggests another focus for looking at what the teacher is requiring in instruction. Hopefully the article will prompt teachers to assess the kinds of questions they ask. If teachers asked the right kinds of questions, they might avoid "wrong" answers.

RT: The report of the author's reserach is too sketchy to be of much value. Crump's recommendations for improving teacher questioning are useful and the bibliography includes many of the "classics" that deal with teacher questioning.

Gaudia, G. The Piagetian dilemma: What does Piaget really have to say to teachers? The Elementary School Journal, 1974, 74, 481-492.

This article presents a cautionary review of Piaget's rationale as it may or may not apply to classroom practices. The author indicates that Piaget is more concerned with investigation than with educational application. The article raises again the historic "nature/nurture" controversy and attempts to relate Piagetian theories to it.

LD: Gaudia's comments may stir uneasy questions as to how an LD student's development "fits into" Piaget's stages of cognitive development. A slow down in the current rush to develop programs based on cognitive stages seems to be needed.

RT: Educators tend to grasp madly at new labels, hoping that at last the magic pill for learning problems has been found. T'aint so, says Gaudia.

Lavatelli, C.S. Piaget's theory applied to an early childhood curriculum. Boston: American Science and Engineering, Inc., 1970.

Lavatelli reviews theories of intelligence, early childhood education, and Piaget's developmental theory. She then suggests instructional guidelines and techniques that will help to stimulate and guide children's cognitive and language development.

LD: This is a good book for LD teachers who need to understand the relationship between cognitive development and language. Specific activities suggested by Lavatelli are excellent assessment tools, if one follows a cognitively based curriculum.

RT: The book is a thorough, comprehensible introduction to Piaget, understandable even by a reader completely unfamiliar with Piagetian concepts. Unfortunately, the section on dialect does not reflect current thinking or research and views dialectal differences as deficient, not just different.

MacGinitie, W.H. Difficulty with logical operations. The Reading Teacher, 1976, 29, 271-375.

MacGintie looks at the logical processes teachers demand of children during instruction. He describes how analogue lessons were developed to study the difficulty of the reasoning required in these lessons.

RT: This article should help teachers become aware of the processes that underlie the tasks they require of children. Hopefully teachers will develop a questioning attitude toward the manuals on which they often depend so heavily.

LD: The article may benefit LD teachers in several ways: It can increase awareness of the complexity of directions in teachers' manuals; it reiterates how very little we do know about the processes children go through in learning to read; it gives several excellent examples of techniques that teachers might use in exploring why children are having difficulty with reading; and it may cause teachers to question whether the fault lies within the child or with the instructional techniques.

Roberts, K.P. Piaget's theory of conservation and reading readiness. The Reading Teacher, 1976, 30, 246-250.

Roberts discusses the theory of conservation and reviews research that has found conservation to be related to reading readiness. She also reports that research has shown that the ability to conserve can be improved with training.

RT: The theories discussed in this article should be of particular interest to teachers of kindergarten and first grade children. The article would have been of even more value had tests of conservation ability been described in detail.

LD: This article should be of special interest to LD teachers of primary age LD students. A heightened awareness of the role that conservation development may have in reading development may encourage the LD teacher to pursue evaluation of a student's ability to conserve in addition to the usual evaluation of reading abilities.

V. Tools for Identifying Learning or Reading Problems

Bradley, J.M. Evaluating reading achievement for placement in special education. Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10, 237-245.

Bradley suggests that research is needed on the validity of achievement tests used for placement in special education. He reports the results of a study of the predictive validity of three reading achievement tests for placing students in basal readers. The results of the study show that 2 of the 3 tests (the WRAT and the Gilmore Oral Paragraphs) over-placed a large percentage of the students.

RT: Bradley's study should be of interest to both regular and special educators who must administer and interpret standardized tests. The results of this study confirm other research that shows that the WRAT especially gives overinflated scores. And yet this test is still commonly used by psychologists and others to measure reading achievement.

LD: The information about specific reading tests will help LD teachers better understand reading evaluation and will give direction for choosing tests which are most valid for evaluating students.

Carroll, A.W. The classroom as an ecosystem. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1974, 6, 1-11.

Carroll explores from the cognitive dissonance viewpoint an ecological model for studying the interaction between the learner and the environment. She proposes that an examination be made of the expectations of the environment. A system for assessing the learner, the environment, and the interaction of the two is described.

LD: The article may help teachers to think about what constitutes the inability to learn and from what various perspectives we should consider learning problems. The article provides an important new direction for assessing learning problems and contains many valuable ideas which could be incorporated with already existing evaluative tools.

RT: The author's specific suggestions for analyzing the classroom environment are thorough and well-organized. However, the model ignores the cognitive aspects of learning. Although the model was not designed to emphasize cognitive factors, any well-packaged checklist runs the risk of being interpreted as a total evaluative package. The author should have stressed more emphatically that one must also assess the cognitive aspects of the task and the learner.

Johnson, D.J. Educational principles for children with learning disabilities. Rehabilitation Literature, 1967, 28, 317-322.

Johnson emphasizes that diagnosis should seek for patterns in a child's responses. She suggests using task analysis to help the teacher focus on processes, not just subject matter.

RT: Teachers of reading should read carefully Johnson's explanation of how a deficit in one area can be manifested by low achievement in another area. They should also note her stress on transferring isolated skills by relating them back to language and communication.

LD: Although this article is fairly old (1967), it contains some specific suggestions that are applicable to LD practices today. Even though the definition of LD has changed somewhat in recent years, LD teachers should consider Johnson's suggestions of looking for learning patterns, diagnosing strengths and weaknesses, collecting objective data, and using diagnosis to plan for remediation. Her emphasis on language is especially pertinent.

Lovitt, T.C. Assessment of children with learning disabilities. Exceptional Children, 1967, 34, 233-239.

Lovitt suggests that when assessing children with learning disabilities, functional data concerning behavior be gathered. In this way diagnostic information can be translated into academic programs.

RT: The value of Lovitt's focus on accumulating extremely precise data rests on the tenuous assumption that completely individualized programs can be based on these data and carried out consistently. Data should not be gathered just as data but only if they can realistically be of use.

LD: Lovitt's article reinforces the need for gathering data on observable behaviors, obtaining reliable base line data, and continuing observations on behaviors remediated through use of these data. The article can be useful in encouraging the evaluator/programmer to make judgments based on good accurate data, not on expectation or preconceived notions.

Mavrogenes, N.A., Hanson, E.F., and Winkley, C.,. A guide to tests of factors that inhibit learning to read. The Reading Teacher, 1976, 29, 343-358.

The authors have compiled an annotated list of diagnostic tests intended to be used to identify factors that may inhibit progress in reading. Included are tests of visual and auditory skills, sensory-motor and perceptual-motor development, articulation, and comprehension and use of language, as well as general screening tests.

RT: The list is well-organized and has much useful information. The list should help teachers of reading to become more aware of possible inhibiting factors and to be better able to interpret the results of tests given by other specialists. The authors include a needed word of caution about using tests with inadequate standardization or validity.

LD: This useful review could have been even better if the comments had also dealt with whether or not the factors being tested do indeed inhibit acquisition of reading skills. The list should help LD teachers to decide the need for further testing and to become aware of the large number of instruments, good and bad, that are available.

Newcomer, P.L. and Hammill, D.D. ITPA and academic achievement: a survey. The Reading Teacher, 1975, 28, 731-741.

The authors report the results of a large number of studies and conclude that the ITPA has little predictive or diagnostic validity.

RT: The ITPA is a good example of the pseudo-scientific mystique that often surrounds the LD field. Both reading and LD teachers need to realize that neither field has found the answers for certain yet.

LD: The article should be valuable in providing LD teachers with solid data about the lack of usefulness of the process construct (as depicted by the ITPA) for educational purposes. Hopefully the article will help redirect LD programs still adhering to the process model of instruction.

Schain, R.J. Neurology of childhood learning disorders. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1972.

Schain discusses in detail various neurological aspects of childhood learning disorders. He presents an overview of the etiological factors of dyslexia and other learning problems citing a great deal of medical research.

LD: Although this is a medically oriented book, it is written in language understandable to the layperson. After reading the book, LD teachers may have a more precise understanding of why some of their students manifest certain behaviors. The final chapter gives a clear, concise system of classifying according to the "primary origin

of the learning disorder." Some teachers will agree with the author that efforts need to be made to understand the primary source of these children's problems.

RT: Schain's thorough review of the evidence concerning causation and symptoms of learning disorders should help some educators re-evaluate their use of labels that have little empirical support.

Venezky, R.L. Testing in reading. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Venezky suggests ten canons for guiding assessment and decision-making about instruction.

RT: This monograph is very short (24 pp.) and to the point. Venezky's canons remove assessment from the realm of mysticism and place it back at the practical level.

LD: These canons again emphasize that assessment must be an integral part of any instructional program. Venezky's monograph, although dealing specifically with reading, is generalizable to all instructional areas.

Wedell, K. Diagnosing learning difficulties: A sequential strategy. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1970, 3, 15-21.

The author proposes a sequence of diagnostic strategies to be used by psychologists in assessing children with learning disabilities.

RT: Wedell's concept of a leveled system of diagnosis can be adapted to many professions. The suggestion for the use of mini-lessons for diagnosis is particularly valuable.

LD: The article provides specific methodology for organizing and ordering an evaluation. Wedell gives examples of potential problem areas and cautions against making too rapid assumptions of cause and effect.

VI. Educational Strategies

Church, M. Does visual perception training help beginning readers? The Reading Teacher, 1974, 27, 361-364.

Church reports the results of a study that showed that a formal training program for visual perception was not superior to an informal program that used gamelike manipulative materials. She also suggests that workbooks may deprive children of opportunities for learning in other areas, such as language development.

RT: Church's article is mislabeled. No control group was used, so the question of whether visual perception training in any form leads to improved reading readiness or reading achievement scores is left unanswered.

LD: While the question of the effect of visual perception training is left unanswered, some worthwhile suggestions of game materials for possible visual-perceptual training are made. The question of what are appropriate goals for kindergarten children is also incidentally raised and may be of interest to teachers exploring factors which may contribute to "early failures."

Foster, G.G., Reese, J.H., Schmidt, C.R., and Ohrtman, W.F. Modality preference and the learning of sight words. Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10, 253-258.

The results of this study showed that subjects with an auditory preference retained significantly more sight words than visual preference subjects when both were taught by auditory methods. Visual learners retained more words when taught visually than auditorally. However auditory and visual learners did about equally well when taught by visual methods and auditory subjects did equally well when taught by either visual or auditory methods. The authors conclude that visual preference subjects were handicapped by being taught by auditory methods.

RT: This research strengthens the position of those educators who suggest that both modalities should be used to teach children to read. In this manner children can choose to utilize the combination of visual and auditory cues which are most beneficial to themselves. In addition this study confirms that few students can be identified as having a strong modality preference.

LD: While some special children may learn better through visually oriented methods, the article confirms that insufficient evidence exists to suggest that modality preference alone should guide reading instruction. The article should help remind the LD teacher of the many aspects involved in reading.

Hammill, D. Training visual perceptual processes. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1972, 5, 552-559.

The author reviews research that defines visual perception, studies that investigate the relationship between reading comprehension and visual perception, and research that looks at the effect of visual perception training on visual perception and on reading. Hammill concludes that there is little correlation between visual perception measures and reading comprehension tests, and that visual perception training programs have no positive effect on reading and possibly none on visual perception itself.

RT: This article confronts the central issues of the role of visual perception training. The review of the literature is thorough and well organized. Hammill's insistence on using only studies in which reading achievement is measured by comprehension tests and not just word recognition scores is commendable.

LD: LD teachers who include training of visual perception in their programs are well advised to read this organized and documented article.

Johnson, D. and Myklebust, H. Learning disabilities: Educational principles and practices. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1967.

This text about learning and language disorders has a psychoneurological emphasis. Criteria for identification of various learning disabilities are given and remedial techniques are suggested.

LD: Despite recent changes in the LD field, much information in the book is still very useful. Of particular interest are the remediation techniques and the emphasis on language.

RT: The format of the book may lead readers to incorrectly perceive various learning disabilities as discrete and easily categorized. This problem is especially apparent in the section on reading disability, in which severe reading problems are described as either visual or auditory dyslexia. The corresponding remediation suggestions emphasize only the visual and auditory aspects of reading and make little use of language cues.

Kenney, E.T. Education for children with learning disabilities. In J. Harstein (Ed.), Current concepts in dyslexia. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1971.

The author reviews techniques and instruments used for identifying students as learning disabled. The rationale for using these instruments is given. The program of a private school for LD children is described in detail.

RT: This article should prove very useful to the educator interested in an introduction to the terminology, areas of interest, and procedures in the LD field. The article shows the bias of some LD theorists toward compensating for rather than remediating learning problems. As a reading teacher I am uneasy with Kenney's stress on the use of instruments that have unproven validity (her own admission) and her interest in deficits that are correlated with poor achievement but have not been shown to be related in a causative way.

LD: Kenney's point that the present LD concept of special help means remediation of learning processes that underlie reading, writing, or arithmetic is not completely accurate. In addition, this reviewer would discount the value of breaking up tasks to comply with the ITPA model. Kenney's stress on unproven instruments is unfortunate. Her description of academic achievement evaluation is important because it emphasizes alternate ways of giving and receiving information. Her sequential and hierarchical model of teaching is interesting and useful if properly adapted.

Kephart, N. Motor bases of achievement. In The Slow Learner in the Classroom Columbus, O.: Charles Merrill Co., 1965, pp. 34-53.

This chapter addresses the need for efficient movement behavior, posture, muscle development, laterality, directionality, and body image are described. Distinction is made between laterality, handedness and directionality. The importance of such constructs in preparation for academic teaching is emphasized.

LD: A review of this chapter is helpful to the LD teacher interested in Kephart's rationale, although the relationship of these attributes to academic subjects is questioned by many researchers. Perhaps the rationale fits best in readiness areas.

RT: Kephart offers no support for his basic hypothesis that higher activities depend "upon the basic structure of the muscular activity upon which they are built" (p. 36). Furthermore he suggests few direct relationships between these motor components and academic achievement. This article may be of value to the reading teacher only as a source of information for knowing what some LD teachers may be talking about.

Kershner, J.R. Reading and laterality revisited. Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9, 269-279.

In this detailed and rather specific article, Kershner reviews recent research in the areas of dominance, hemisphere, lateralization, and spatial abilities in order to examine the relationship between reading, laterality, and hemispheric processing.

LD: The article is somewhat detailed for a reader with limited backgroupd in this area; however it can provide an overview for one interested in research concerning specific neurological and physiological aspects which the author feels are related to reading. The article should also enhance a reader's general knowledge of the broad parameters of LD and reading disorders. Unfortunately Kershner provides no information on what to do with this knowledge.

RT: The article is extremely complex and highly speculative. The studies pertaining to reading deal primarily with letter recognition rather than with the reading of words or connected text. The author fails to provide convincing evidence that spatial assymetry itself does have an effect on reading; furthermore he admits that programs to train laterality have not been successful.

Larsen, S.C. The influence of teacher expectations on the school performance of handicapped child, Focus on Exceptional Children, 1975, 8, 1-13.

Larsen presents the components and effects of teacher expectations on students and discusses the implications these expectations may have for special education. The author reviews the research on self-fulfilling prophecies and teacher expectation and indicates that intervention may be needed at the instructor level as much as at the student level. Assumptions underlying what may or may not be handicapping conditions are identified, with a stress on what seems to be the teacher's role in creating success or failure.

LD: Despite the lack of specific reference to LD students, this article is a very important one for LD teachers. The understanding of the effect of teacher expectation, of what labeling does to inhibit learning and of the need to create more flexible instructional situations in all learning areas is vital. This article seems to point towards a direction of teacher change which hopefully may eliminate learning problems in many areas.

RT: Teachers of all children should carefully consider the author's point of view. The article is especially important for teachers involved in mainstreaming the child with special educational needs.

Minskoff, E.H. Creating and evaluating remediation for the learning disabled. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1973, 5, 1-11.

The author discusses a variety of methods and materials that may be devised, or puchased by LD teachers. The purposes of the author are: 1) to give guidelines for teachers to create or modify materials to meet the needs of LD students; 2) to assist teachers in evaluating materials; and 3) to provide teachers with criteria for assessing research on the efficacy of materials and methods.

LD: The guidelines are excellent. Some of the examples given relate to concerns no longer stressed in many LD programs; however, the generalities still apply.

RT: Most of the guidelines are excellent and would be very compatible with current theory in the development of reading. However, No. 8 (Provide Small Steps in a Graduated Sequence of Learning) shows a lack of understanding of the contribution of language to reading and does not acknowledge the desirable behavior of looking at whole words. Although the example given may help train visual memory, overuse of this suggestion is not advisable.

Minskoff, E. H. Remediating auditory-verbal learning disabilities: The role of questions in teacher-pupil interaction. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1974, 7, 406-413.

Minskoff describes questions that may be used in teacher-pupil verbal interaction to remediate specific auditory and verbal disabilities. Some guidelines are given for constructing appropriate questions in several areas, including reading comprehension.

LD: This important article gives direction to the LD teacher for using a powerful remediation tool--the development of comprehension through carefully organized questioning. The stress on language and cognitive development is helpful; however the article's allusion to deficits in processes and the questions suggested for remediation of deficient process areas lessens its impact.

RT: The author's detailed rationale for using specific kinds of questions for certain disabilities has credibility only if one accepts the validity of the ITPA and the process model for disability. When discussing reading comprehension, the author abandons the specificity she used when dealing with process and treats reading comprehension only in the broadest terms.

Newcomer, P.L. and Goodman, L. Effect of modality of instruction on the learning of meaningful and nonmeaningful material by auditory and visual learners. Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9, 261-268.

This article demonstrates that despite the appeal of aptitude-treatment interaction instructional programs, there is no evidence that supports their value. Results of the author's research indicate that most children appear to benefit from instruction with visual materials and that those with serious academic difficulties "will benefit from as many meaningful associations to new material as the teacher can demonstrate."

LD: The article further emphasizes the need to evaluate programs and the rationale on which they are based as well as methods used.

RT: The article confirms the belief of many reading theorists that learning is often best accomplished by presenting the learner with the whole task and allowing the learner to interact with it in his or her unique manner.

Orlando, C. and Lynch, J. Learning disabilities or educational casualties? Where do we go from here? The Elementary School Journal, 1974, 74, 461-467.

Orlando and Lynch criticize the trend in evaluation of looking for a deficit in the student rather than in the goals and directions of the educational system itself. The authors indicate that many educational disabilities are caused by an inflexible instructional system. They review the problems of differentiating between students who mature slowly and those who have problems that inhibit learning. The article includes a plea for more flexible instruction with more application of learning to functional life uses. Specific information is given for ways to structure an instructional program for students with learning problems.

LD: The article provides a good review of some educational causes of learning problems and includes a specific review of good, well-organized teaching techniques. This article should be excellent for alerting all education staff to the need for diagnostic-prescriptive teaching.

RT: For the teacher of reading this article has two important implications: 1) Because children learn in different ways, forcing all children to identify words in a pre-selected, prescribed manner is simply not defensible. 2) Teachers should provide children with sets of strategies, not just with expertise in isolated skills.

Spiegel, D.L. Holistic approach to diagnosis and remediation. The Reading Teacher, 1974, 27, 370-374.

This article gives an overview of holistic approaches to reading, including a review of several specific theories and the implications that such theories have for the diagnosis of and programming for students with reading disabilities. The author underscores the importance of meaning and language in reading instruction. She also stresses the need for sufficient instruction in decoding skills to enable the beginning reader to have a base from which to form meaningful predictions.

LD: The review of specific theories and techniques should provide the LD teacher with background for understanding a variety of approaches for reading instruction. The article should also be helpful to LD teachers in their search for possible factors inhibiting learning to read.

RT: The article should provide teachers with guidelines for balancing skill work with exercises that emphasize the place of these skills in the total reading process.

Sullivan, J. The effects of Kephart's perceptual-motor training on a reading clinic sample. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1972, 5, 545, 551.

The author concludes that perceptual-motor training does not benefit poor readers in the middle and upper grades. The perceptual-motor training included chalkboard, ocular pursuit, and sensory-motor exercises.

RT: This study supports the belief of many reading teachers that remediation of reading problems should be approached primarily through activities directly related to reading itself and not through isolated attention to peripheral factors.

LD: This article should force LD teachers committed to perceptual-motor training as a prerequisite to reading to take a critical look at the goals of their programming. The article adds more evidence to the proposition that the most effective way to teach reading is through reading-related tasks.

Thomas, J.R., Chissom, B.S., Stewart, C., and Shelley, F. Effects of perceptual-motor training on preschool children: A multi-variant approach. Research Quarterly, 1975, 46, 505-513.

The results of a study designed to investigate the effects of perceptual-motor training on the perceptual-motor development, self-concept, and academic ability of kindergarten children are reported. The training did appear to have some short-term transfer to academic abilities, but this benefit was not lasting.

RT: Once again perceptual-motor training does not seem to have an effect on academic abilities. Perceptual-motor training improves perceptual-motor abilities, but doesn't have any effect on the skills related to reading.

LD: The lack of proof that perceptual motor skills transfer to academic tasks should encourage LD teachers to reassess goals and purposes of activities within LD programs.

Whistler, N.G. Training in first grade: Effect on visual discrimination and reading ability. Elementary School Journal, 1974, 75, 50-54.

Whistler reports the results of a study that investigated the effect of visual memory training. She concludes that visual memory training resulted in significantly greater gains in visual discrimination abilities and in word reading when the experimental group was compared to a control group. The training appeared to have had little value for improving paragraph meaning scores.

RT: Readers should note that Whistler wisely used words and letters, not geometric designs, in her successful training program.

LD: The study reaffirms that visual discrimination and visual memory training should use actual words and letters. Whistler's article provides more questions than solutions.

Ysseldyke, J.E. and Salvia, J. Diagnostic prescriptive teaching Two models. Exceptional Children, 1974, 181-185.

The author contrasts two theoretical models underlying diagnostic-prescriptive teaching: ability training and task analysis. The assumptions underlying diagnostic-prescriptive teaching are specified. The authors conclude that the task analysis model meets those assumptions while the ability training model does not. The article ends with a directive for experimental control and precise evaluation of programs based on ability training.

LD: This article is clearly a call for stricter supervision of the kinds of programs that are being developed for students within LD classes. It points out the need for LD teachers to research and review the rationale behind their instructional methods.

RT: Ysseldyke and Salvia provide a well-reasoned and convincing attack on the ability training approach that underlies instruction in some LD classrooms. Reading teachers who have focused on reading instruction will find much to support their practices.